

NOTES FROM THE FIELD.

Please announce our Love Feast Tuesday evening, the 16th, commencing at 4 o'clock. Invitation is extended to all who wish to participate.

SHELLY ARTHUR.

Roan, Ind.

The South Bend City church will be ready for dedication the first or second Sunday in Dec. The plastering is all done and the work is being pushed briskly along. The Portage Brethren will be ready to dedicate before that time. Truly your sister,

BELLE EWING.

Charles P. Folkerth and family left Dayton this morning en route for Los Angeles, Cal., where they intend making their future home. The Dayton City church loses two valuable members in brother and sister Folkerth. The prayers and good wishes of their many friends follow them to their new home. May the Lord prosper them spiritually and temporally and may their zeal in His cause never be diminished.

SAMUEL KIEHL.

Dayton, Ohio, Nov. 2, 1886.

Burr Oak, Kans.

DEAR BRETHREN:—I am willing to respond to Henry's last appeal and add ten per cent to my first donation in order to raise the College debt. Go thou reader and do likewise, is Gospel, and we will have that arduous task completed, the Lord loveth a cheerful giver. Yours in love,

H. E. FAIDLEY.

Nov. 4, 1886.

To the Brethren of Kansas.

I have finally concluded to enter the field once more and shall start to your state about November 20th. The first stop will be at Parsons, thence to Nickerson. I will leave the arrangements with the Brethren in charge at those and other places. You can address me for further information. I will be back to Indiana about the first of January.

J. C. CRIPE.

Dowagiac, Mich.

North Star to Ashland.

At an early hour, even before the dawn of day, on Oct. 21st, we bid our old home and friends at North Star good-by and started on a journey of 150 miles, to the N. E., to Ashland, O., where we arrived at 3 p. m., strangers in a strange land. As we stepped on the platform at the depot, a gentlemen accosted us, asked our names and told us his name was Garber, whose proffered hospitalities we at once embraced.

In due time our goods arrived and at this writing we are again enjoying our own fireside in our new home on Claremont Avenue, where we will bid welcome any from the Valley. In our next we will give a description of Ashland and the surrounding country and later of Ashland College.

SILAS E. SHOOK.

When alone, guard your thoughts; when in the temple, guard your temper; when in company, guard your words.

If every person would be half as good as he expects his neighbor to be, what a heaven this world would be.—Luther Norris.

Slippery places may fling up the heels of great giants, and little temptations may overthrow well-grown Christians.—Lee.

The Unfortunate Expression.

If calling things by their right name is unfortunate, and, therefore should not find their way into the EVANGELIST, then instead of raising to her topical heading, "Let us go on unto perfection," let the EVANGELIST substitute the following:

"Admitted to these columns only what is evasive and compromising." The expression referred to last week occurs above my signature where I called the "open communion" advocated by several good brethren, "Unbaptized believer's communion." I stand by that term as the right name for the kind of communion they have in view. If I am wrong then sprinkling or pouring for baptism is right, and as that is easier and more convenient let us adopt it. Are you ready for it Brethren? I hear the answer sweeping back No! No! Most of our children and many of our neighbors, not yet immersed, though believing that true immersion is the only scriptural mode of baptism, were to come together and commune would be no less an unbaptized believer's communion "is that of pedo-baptist."

The old church's, (I presume the G. B., are referred to) exclusiveness was denounced in the Progressive papers, but never as I remember, for holding to the baptized believer's communion; for that is the faith and practice of nine tenths of all the membership of the Brethren Church today. But it is asked, is it Progressive Christianity to leave uninvited at our communion the advocates of pouring or sprinkling? Right here I repeat my challenge: "Show me an instance where an unbaptized person ever sat with the early Christians at the Lord's table at their request or encouragement?" It can't be done; and yet the early Christians were just as progressive and if any difference more so than we are. What the translators, the Bible societies, the missionaries and benefactors of the race have done for the world, is all good in its place; but the translator's failure to render into pure English the word baptizo and thus frustrate the unity of practice in the Apostolic church, and the unbaptized missionaries receiving and teaching for doctrine the commandment of men in the mode of baptism. We also remember and hold that they themselves should have been taught the way of the Lord more perfectly before going out to teach others, and should have put on Christ in baptism according to the commission and the figure given, by St. Paul to the Romans.

Now we don't call a few drops of water sprinkled on another's forehead or a pale of water poured down over another's head baptism; and we don't call a small particle of bread and a sip of wine taken at noonday a supper. Yet because we don't say to these errorists, come set down to the Lord's table we are by some of our brethren called exclusive, uncharitable, and charged with unchristianizing them. Don't ask them to do that. They have not faith in washing feet and do not extend the salutation—for whatsoever is not of faith is sin. "Behold I have set before thee an open door"—to the hearing, receiving and obeying of the truth—"and no man can

shut it" has no reference to any thing relating to the point under discussion; only so far as the truth obeyed will lead us in the right manner, and in the right spirit to the Lord's table.

So far as the creeds and songs of the various churches are concerned they are the invention of uninspired men and religious men use them in their worship just as they use each other's commentaries and scriptural exegesis.

It is said that charity is the only solution to the vexed question of open or close communion, but let me remind all that charity does not compromise with error, but holds our investigations of this subject up to the calcium light of God's eternal truth and though the ring of the word exclusiveness, used so frequently in criticism, may fall upon my ears like a thunder clap, yet my views of the communion question is no less the result of my study of the noble God-given creed, adopted at the Progressive Convention in this city in the year 1883.

EDWARD S. MILLER.

Dayton, O.

Close and Open Communion.

The letter published below is interesting because it presents the views of the brother on his relation to other Christian people in the communion service:

CLOSE VS OPEN COMMUNION.

I am very much interested in the investigation of the Scriptures as they relate to the communion service.

The discussion seems to arise from the use of two words as applied to the communion service. The two words are "Close" vs "Open" Communion. I would like for the editor of the EVANGELIST, or some brother who has the subject in hand to define these two words as used in this discussion.

Does Open Communion mean that our members have the right or privilege to commune with other Christian denominations as they commune. If so, I am not in favor of Open Communion. But if it means that we will allow other Christian people to partake of, or take part in washing feet, the Lord's Supper and the bread and wine with us, as we commune, then until I have more light on the subject, I am in favor of "Open" Communion. I believe our communion service is right according to the Scriptures. Then while I should not do wrong, by partaking of an abridged or wrong service, I do not feel like prohibiting other Christians from doing right by partaking with us.

ELDER J. MYERS.

San Diego, California.

Our brother is in favor of open communion. Close communion means that no one shall be allowed a seat at the Lord's table except those who are known to be members of the same church.

Open Communion in this discussion, means to allow members in good standing of other Christian denominations to take seats at our tables if they desire. A member in good standing in other denominations are those who show evidence of a Christian character and religious lives. So far as communing with other religious denominations is concerned, it has not entered into this discussion.

As a minister of a church, we shall persuade no one to come to the table, and we will drive no one away who comes of his own free will and is Christian in character. The word will be sent out that there is to be a communion. The taught will know what to do. The condition is being born again, and competency to discern the Body. If they know brethren who are worthy and the announcement is carried to them and they choose to come with them, no examination will be held. The one who is born of the spirit can eat and drink worthily. All others who eat and drink, eat and drink condemnation upon themselves. Therefore we will persuade no one to come to the table of the Lord. We never want to feel that we have been instrumental in causing any one to eat and drink damnation to his own soul. How terrible! What a great sin this would be. Let God's servants beware that they do not share in committing this great sin by persuading the unworthy. We are commanded to pray, to preach the gospel, to baptize and to teach the people to observe; but no one is authorized to urge any one to eat of the symbol of the Lord's body or drink of the symbol of his blood. Even there is not a command anywhere in the holy Scriptures that orders any one to eat or drink, although all feel that it is necessary to

do both. Behold how the Scriptures throw the whole responsibility upon us by giving the very broadest privilege. Therefore, where the gospel does not persuade let no Lord's servant persuade; where the gospel does not invite, let no man invite, where the gospel does not urge, let no ambassador urge.

Men should be taught what is necessary to worthily partake of the communion of the body of Christ, and after that they should judge as to their fitness.

We are strongly in favor of private communion, which is practically close. Communion is an observance, as we see it, entirely between the individual and Christ. It is only a pledge of faithfulness to Christ, and the making of a pledge is as receiving new strength to accomplish a work. As we view it, it is no bond of union between individuals who comprise a body of believers. The only bond of union that Christ has given is love. Wherever this bond unites a company of believers, they can engage in the solemn services together. Christ has never commanded that only a peculiar class of individuals are competent to consecrate the holy emblems. Every member who is reborn, is competent to do that service. Every member is also competent to baptize. But where the bond—love—has united and particular persons have been set apart to do the service of the church, then it is wrong for a laity to baptize and consecrate the elements at all ordinary times, because it would be disrespecting authority and introducing confusion. The communion is a matter, therefore, between us and God. To a mind thus constituted, it looks very improper to make the observance a public exhibition to call out the ridicule, and afford amusement to the profane.

In the matter of communion our practice can consistently be close, but when we begin to make a doctrine, or in other words a creed, let us be careful what is done. Let us be liberal in allowances on the side of charity. Even the ancient made allowances for the want of baptism, in this way, when a church presumed a person to have been truly baptized, he himself believing so too, he was admitted to communion, and though it appeared at last that his baptism was doubtful, or he had not been baptized at all, yet constant communicating with the church was thought to supply this defect or want of baptism. This was not Scripture but their judgment.

But accidental communion by a child or a grown person, or through mistake, did not replace baptism, but the rule was to take the person immediately after and baptize him.

The question was put to Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, what should be done with a child who communed through ignorance or mistake, and he replied, "Let him be baptized." The Apostolic Constitutions also gives similar directions in disposing of such cases.

In the life of Dioynsius, "a certain person, who for many years had assembled and communicated, happened to be present at the baptism of some who were lately baptized." He came to him weeping, and confessed that the baptism he received was nothing like that which he saw administered. So he applied for re-baptism, but he was refused, with the words, "His communicating for so long was sufficient to the purpose. But we would warn all against such a method of becoming church members. This is no argument that others should try to be Christians by not doing what the Gospel asks. It only shows that those early Christian bishops used their judgments. These cases where the baptism was discovered to have been irregular, the rebirth is acknowledged. But where there was no evidence of rebirth as in the cases of accidental communion, baptism was ordered as an escape from the sin of unworthy communion.

Now brethren let God's word and prayer be our guide in this matter. Let us be earnest seekers for that which is most expedient in the sight of God.

A. L. GARBER.

If God gives us food for our lives, let us not, with murmuring Israel, ask food for our lusts.

He that is afraid of solemn things has probably solemn reason to be afraid of them.—Spurgeon.

I never think he is quite ready for another world who is weary of this.—Hattie A. Hamilton.

The Communion Question.

Let us be careful Brethren and Sisters that we do not drift little by little into something perhaps just the same as the commandments of men which we said we left when we denounced the man-made laws, and the Standing Committee of A. M. and said, and do say, openly before the world, that the Bible, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible shall be our only rule of faith and practice.

Brethren and sisters, if we are true followers of Christ, we will all be of one faith and of one mind, for we are commanded to be that. If you my brother or my sister say that one action in baptism is all that is necessary according to the commission and I say it takes three actions to fill that, where is the oneness and of one mind. And you say the washing of one another's feet at our love feasts is all foolishness, which I have heard some professor, say, and I say it is a command, are we one in this? And you say the supper that we eat at our communion, is not a command of Christ's for the supper that Christ ate with his disciples, that night, the account of which we have in the thirteenth chapter of John was the Jewish Passover. I say it was not, where is the one mind between you and me? And you say that the practice of the Brethren saluting each other with a kiss is not a command and it is all foolishness, which I have heard professors say, and I say it is commanded by the inspired apostles five times in the New Testament, where is the one mind and one faith in this? And you say, that little children should be baptized, and do that by dropping a few drops of water on the head; I say that little children are saved without any baptism that Christ died for that original sin, and that little children are not accountable, until they come to know right from wrong, and judge for themselves: where are we of one mind in this? And you say that sprinkling and pouring is baptism; I say immersion in the water is baptism, and sprinkling or pouring is not baptism: where is the one mind and one faith in this?

I see in a late EVANGELIST some of our brethren are discussing the subject of open and close communion. Brethren this should not be discussed amongst the brethren, if any one or some of the other churches that do not believe that it is essential to obey the ordinances commanded by Christ and the Apostles, assails us on that point, then we should defend our church and prove to them by the gospel, that there must be a union when we have a communion. I am surprised to see and hear how loose some of the brethren seem to be on this important question.

Some of our brethren would say come and partake with us that is all right. God forbid that we should open that door. If we do, where and when can we close it? If one of our members commits a deed that the church must expel him according to the Gospel, he will find a church that will take him in, and perhaps at our next communion he will set at our side at the table of the Lord, eating damnation to himself, and perhaps, we doing the same by opening this door. Brethren for God's sakes, and for the sake of our beloved church, let us be careful and prayerful, and take heed what we do in this respect. We have those here with us who trample the commands of our blessed Savior in the dust, which we hold sacred and then would come and sit down with us at the Lord's table. Where is the union dear brethren and sisters. I do not think we would have it with God. At my house I invite all and anyone, at our meal time, to sit down and partake with us. This is my table, but when it comes to the table of the Lord, that is only for his obedient children to partake of, and not for the disobedient. If any is not willing to become obedient to all the commands and ordinances in the gospel, there is yet something wrong, and if we are ashamed of Christ and of his words and commands we are none of his.

Brethren do not treat this question so lightly as I see it has been done by several, and do not say that it is no particular profit, and that it is not essential to Salvation. We are commanded to come out from among them and be a separate people. I think it is essential to Salvation. We want to be obedient, so far, as I am individually concerned, I am not over anxious that any others should commune with us, neither am I anxious that they should stay away. If this is your mind, tell the people when you preach, that you are not anxious whether they are obedient or not. Brethren and sisters what I have written, I have written through love for the church.

DANIEL SHOOK.

Downs, Kans., Oct. 14th, 1886.

A Popular Literary Work.

The third volume of Alden's "Cyclopedia of Universal Literature," now ready (cloth binding 60 cents, half Morocco 75 cents), contains 406 pages, and represents eighty-six of the most famous authors of the world, of all nations and languages, including among others: Bossuet, Boswell, Bronte, Brougham, Browning, Bryant, Buffon, Buckle, Burke, Burns, Burroughs, closing with Byron. There are nearly three hundred choice literary selections representing these authors—a truly wonderful amount of entertaining literature for a little money. The following are representative opinions of this work by competent literary critics:

"The third volume strengthens the good opinion formed by its predecessors. The articles, though brief, are remarkably comprehensive, presenting in a few pithy paragraphs the very facts the reader most wishes to know, while the extracts from the writings of the authors described are selected with discriminating taste. We are much pleased with the work. It bids fair to be, when completed, the best cyclopedia of literature in the language."—The Interior, Chicago.

"Mr. Alden's idea and enterprise in the execution of it should be encouraged generously. He places within the reach of all who read, a good knowledge of the world's literature and of those who have made it, and helps them to form a good literary taste, and to desire literary culture. To know what is for him to read, is the first difficulty of the self-instructor. This cyclopedia tells him, with illustrative quotations. To all it is a complete and reliable guide to the best reading."—Commercial Advertiser, Detroit, Mich.

"The articles are remarkably comprehensive, presenting in a few pithy paragraphs the very facts the reader most wishes to know, while the extracts from the writings of the authors described are selected with discriminating taste. We are much pleased with the work."—Standard of the Cross Cleveland, Ohio.

The work is designed to be completed in 15 volumes. The publisher offers a sample volume, post-paid, for the nominal price of 35 cents, on condition that within three days after receipt you will either remit the remainder of the price or return the book, in which case your money will be refunded—half Morocco binding 50 cents, on the same conditions. Descriptive catalogue of the publisher's very large list of standard books, sent free. JOHN B. ALDEN, Publisher, 393 Pearl St., New York.

Where there is no hope there can be no endeavor.—Dr. Johnson.

The aching head may cease to throb when laid upon that softest pillow for human pain—God knows!"